

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT GREENEVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
v. ) No. 2:18-CR-051  
CHAMP TERRY SKAGGS, JR. )

## **MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

The defendant is charged with violating the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act. He has filed two motions to dismiss the indictment. [Docs. 28, 45]. The United States has responded in opposition. [Docs. 29, 46].

United States Magistrate Judge H. Bruce Guyton and then-United States Magistrate Judge Clifton L. Corker have conducted a series of hearings on the defendant's ever-evolving motions. Now before the Court is Magistrate Judge Guyton's November 25, 2019 report and recommendation ("R&R"), recommending that the defendant's motions be denied. [Doc. 67].

The defendant objects to the R&R, continuing to argue that the instant indictment should be dismissed. [Doc. 69]. The defendant, in his 1.5 page objection, “relies on the previously raised arguments from the Motion to Dismiss and Supplement, and the oral arguments raised at the hearing held on September 5, 2019.” [Doc. 69, p.1]. The defendant “rel[ies] in full on the written pleadings, as those fully detail the issues raised with the exception of the categorical approach challenge presented to the Magistrate,

detailed in the Report and Recommendation in pages 17-24.” *Id.*

A district court is both statutorily and constitutionally required to conduct a *de novo* review of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation. *See United States v. Shami*, 754 F.2d 670, 672 (6th Cir. 1985). However, it is necessary only to review “those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The district court need not provide *de novo* review where objections to a report and recommendation are frivolous, conclusive, or general. *See Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986).

The present R&R fully sets forth the pertinent facts, authority, and analysis. Those points need not be repeated herein. Because the Court finds itself in full agreement with Magistrate Judge Guyton’s findings and conclusions, the defendant’s general objection [doc. 69] is **OVERRULED**.

The Court **ADOPTS** the findings of fact and conclusions of law set out in the report and recommendation [doc. 67]. It is **ORDERED** that the defendant’s motions to dismiss [docs. 28, 45] are **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

ENTER:

---

s/ Leon Jordan  
United States District Judge